UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,115	07/03/2003	Vladimir Baranov	079012-0102	7685

22428 7590 01/11/2008

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
COOK, LISA V	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1641	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,115	BARANOV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa V. Cook	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,20-27 and 29-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *30-36* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,20-27 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/07 has been entered.

Amendment Entry

2. Applicant's amendment filed 10/31/07 is acknowledged. In the amendment filed therein claims 1-6, 10-14, 20, 22-27, and 29 were modified. Claims 15-19 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 30-36 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Presently, claims 1-6, 10-14, 20, 22-27 and 29 are under consideration.

3. Rejections and/or objections of record not reiterated herein have been withdrawn.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTIONS NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

I. Claims 1-5, 20-21 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289).

The instant claims recite a "kit" in the preamble, however the body of the claims merely read on reagent compositions. Houk et al. disclose the reagents in the claims and has been applied as such.

Houk et al. disclose methods and reagents to measure positive ion mass and trace elements in ICP-MS procedures. See abstract and page 2283 2nd column. Houk et al. also teach the analysis of biological fluids such as urine or blood serum. See page 2288 2nd column-last paragraph. The procedure is taught to facilitate applications of the ICP-MS approach to elemental and isotopic determinations in samples of total solute content greater than 150 μg/ml. See page 2289. Various elements are discussed in Table IV on page 2287.

Accordingly Houk et al. read on Applicants claims regarding a transition element having an atomic number of 21-29, 39-47, 57-79 or 89 (see specification page 28 section 0122).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

II. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) in view of Maggio (Immunoenzyme technique I, CRC press © 1980, pages 186-187).

Please see Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) as set forth above.

Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching reagent immobilization (bound to solid support).

However, Maggio disclose enzyme immunoassays wherein either the antigen or antibody is immobilized onto a solid phase. The solid phase can be particles, cellulose, polyacrylamide, agarose, discs, tubes, beads, or micro plates (micro titer plates). See page 186. The reagents can be bound to the solid support by covalent linkage or passive adsorption (non-covalent means). See page 187 1st paragraph. Maggio taught that solid supports such as test strips "are very convenient to wash thereby reducing labor in assay procedures". Page 186, last line.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to immobilize assay reagents on solid support surfaces as taught by Maggio in the assay method/reagents of Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) because Maggio taught that reagent immobilized solid supports "are very convenient to wash thereby reducing labor in assay procedures". Page 186, last line. Absent evidence to the contrary the immobilization of reagents is deemed an obvious modification of Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289).

III. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) in view of Foster et al. (US Patent #4,444,879).

Please see Houk et al. as set forth above.

Although Houk et al. disclose the reagents required by the claims; it does not specifically teach the reagents in kit configurations including standards and buffers. However, kits are well known embodiments for assay reagents. Foster et al. (U.S. Patent #4,444,879) describe one example. In their patent kits including the reactant reagents, a microplate, positive controls, negative controls, standards, various buffers, and instructions are taught. The reagents are compartmentalized or packaged separately for utility. See figure 6, and column 15, lines 10-34.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to take the detection assay reagents embodiments as taught by Houk et al. and format them into a kits including standards and buffers because Foster et al. taught that it is convenient to do so and one can enhance sensitivity of a method by providing reagents as a kit.

Further, the reagents in a kit are available in pre-measured amounts, which eliminates the variability that can occur when performing the assay. Kits are also economically beneficial in reagent distribution.

IV. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) in view of Neilsen et al. (Spectrochimica Acta Part B, 53, 1998, 339-345).

Please see Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) as set forth above.

Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) differ from the instant invention in not teaching reagents for analyses related to laser ablation inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry and *gel electrophoresis*.

However, a procedure and reagents useful in inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry and further comprising electrophoresis is taught by Neilsen et al. Neilsen et al. employed both immunoelectrophoresis and laser ablation inductively coupled plasma (ICP)-mass spectrometry for the identification and quantification of metal binding proteins in blood serum.

Human serum was enriched with commercially available Co (Cobalt-supplied by Merck) was subjected to electrophoresis and the agarose gels corresponding to the 1st and 2nd dimensions were interrogated and analyzed using a Nd Yag laser (1064 nm) interfaced to ICP-mass spectrometry. See abstract, page 341 – 2.2.

Neilsen et al. taught that electrophoresis is a powerful separation procedure (page 340, 1st column, 2nd paragraph) and laser ablation is a versatile solid sampling tool in ICP-spectrometry (page 340, 1st column, 3rd paragraph). The combination provided a novel route for studying metal protein distribution in serum (peak response was linear with concentration and the method showed precise replication (6% RSD), with a detection limit of 0.29ng. See abstract and page 345 Conclusion.

With respect to the transition element or metal being positively charged or adapted to posses a positive charge, it is noted that Houk et al. disclose the same transition metals as the ones claimed and Neilsen teaches the detection procedures as claimed. Absent evidence to the contrary, they necessarily teach the positive charged characteristic.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to measure transition elements (tags) linked to antibodies in the laser ablation inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry in combination with gel electrophoresis as taught by Neilsen et al. in the method/reagents because Neilsen et al. taught that the electrophoresis is a powerful separation procedure (page 340, 1st column, 2nid paragraph) and laser ablation is a versatile solid sampling tool in ICP-spectrometry (page 340, 1st column, 3rd paragraph).

The combination provided a novel route for studying metal protein distribution in serum (peak response was linear with concentration and the method showed precise replication (6% RSD), with a detection limit of 0.29ng. See abstract and page 345 Conclusion.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to acquire the enhanced sensitivity, wherein accurate and precise detection is rapidly available.

V. Claims 22 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) in view of Crooke (WO 99/451450).

Please see Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289) as set forth above.

Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289)differs from the instant invention in not specifically teaching methods/reagents utilizing a plurality of tagged transition elements linked to a plurality of biologically active.

These limitations are taught in the methods/reagents of Crooke et al. Crooke et al. are drawn to mass spectrometric methods for biomolecular screening. See abstract. The method provides for screening ligand or combinatorial libraries of compounds against one or more than one biological target molecules. See abstract.

In other words the methods provide for the determining the interaction between one and a plurality of molecular species. See page 1, especially lines 17-19. In one embodiment different molecular weigh tags (distinguishable element tags) are utilized to detect different nucleic acid targets (biologically active materials). See page 10, line 19 for example.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to measure a plurality of biologically active materials bound to transition elements (tags) as taught by Crooke et al. in the method/reagent of Houk et al. (Analytical Chemistry, 1980, Vol.52, pages 2283-2289), because Crooke et al. taught that his method significantly accelerated screening efforts because multiple targets could be screened simultaneously against large numbers of compounds. See page 10 line 25-27. This would reduce processing time, allowing for more data on various compounds simultaneously.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants arguments and amendment were found persuasive. New grounds of rejection have been presented.

7. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

8. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Group TC 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see httpr//pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa V. Cook
Remsen 3C-59
(571) 272-0816
1/7/08